



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,812	12/11/2000	Mark A. Peloquin	AUS9-2000-0529-US1	2076

35525 7590 06/24/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2194

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/734,812

Applicant(s)

PELOQUIN ET AL.

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-15, 17-20, 22-28 and 30-33 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 9, 23 and 25 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8, 10-15, 17-20, 22, 24, 26-28 and 30-33 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-31 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 11-15, 17-20, 27, 28, 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (5,829,053).

3. As to claim 1, Smith teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: loading a set of feature plug-in modules (col 4, ln 32-33/ ln 47-50), selecting a first plurality of feature plug-in modules from the set of feature plug-in module (mapping plug-in associated with two child stores 62 and 64, but no partition plug-ins for those child stores, col 5, ln 54-58), applying the first plurality of feature modules to a first partition of device (col 4, ln 33-39/ln 64-66), ordering the first of plurality of feature plug-in modules(a mapping plug-in 82 is used at the logical store level with a RAID logical store 80, a mapping plug-in 67a-d are associated with child stores 68 a-d, col 6, ln 25-30 and ln 35-40). Smith does not explicit teach the term “volume”. However, Smith teaches each partitioned device (col 3, ln 10-12). It would be obvious to one of the skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Smith

Art Unit: 2194

because Smith's volume would provides a partitioning schema for a block storage memory system which allows the nesting of partitioning formats and avoids replication of partition codes.

4. **As to claim 2**, Smith teaches receiving logical volume manager data associated with the at least one aggregate (col 6, ln 6-10), selecting the first plurality of feature plug-in modules based on the logical volume manager data associated with the at least one aggregate (col 6, ln 16-19/ Fig. 5 b), selecting the first plurality of feature plug-in modules based on the logical volume manager data associated with at least one aggregate (col 5, ln 54-58/ Fig. 5b).

5. **As to claim 3**, Smith teaches receiving logical volume manager data associated with the at least one partition (col 6, ln 9-11), selecting the first plurality of features plug-in modules based on the logical volume manager data associated with the at least one partition (col 5, ln 60-65/ col 6, ln 1-5/ Fig. 5 b).

6. **As to claim 4**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 3; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above.

7. **As to claim 11**, Smith teaches a feature stack (col 6, ln 1-5/ ln 25-50/ ln 35-40).

8. **As to claim 12**, Smith teaches selecting a first plurality of feature plug-in modules from the set of feature plug-in module (mapping plug-in associated with two child stores 62 and 64, but no partition plug-ins for those child stores, col 5, ln 54-58), ordering the first of plurality of feature plug-in modules (a mapping plug-in 82 is used at the logical store level with a RAID logical store 80, a mapping plug-in 67a-d are associated with child stores 68 a-d, col 6, ln 25-30 and ln 35-40), applying the first plurality of feature modules to a second partition of device(col 4, ln 33-39/ln 64-66).

Art Unit: 2194

9. As to claim 13, Smith teaches at least one feature plug-in module in the second plurality of feature plug-in modules is not in the first plurality of feature plug-in module (col 5, ln 55-58).

10. As to claim 14, Smith teaches at least the first and second plurality of feature plug-in modules are order differently (partitioning plug-in associated with parent store, mapping plug-in associated with child store, fig. 4b).

11. As to claims 15, 17-20, they are apparatus claims of claims 1-4; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-4 above.

12. As to claim 27, Smith teaches a feature stack (col 6, ln 1-5/ ln 25-50/ ln 35-40).

13. As to claims 28, 30 and 31, they are apparatus claims of claim 1; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

14. Claims 5, 6, 8, 16, 21, 22, 24, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (5,829,053) in view of Lorenz et al (US. Patent 6,405,366 B1).

15. As to claim 5, Smith does not teach a selection of feature plug-in modules by a user; and selecting the first plurality of feature plug-in modules based on the selection. However, Lorenz teaches a selection of feature plug-in modules by a user; and selecting the first plurality of feature plug-in modules based on the selection (user may select from a directory of list of available plug-ins to use, col 9, ln 32-35).

16. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Smith and Lorenz because Lorenz's user may select from a

Art Unit: 2194

directory of list of available plug-ins to use would allow the user to configure the plug-in module for accessing the file system.

17. As to claim 6, Lorenz teaches classification information corresponding to the first plurality of feature plug-in modules, the class for each feature plug-in module (col 9, ln 35-38), ordering the first plurality of feature plug-in based on the classification (col 1, ln 52-56).

18. As to claim 8, Lorenz teaches ordering the first plurality of feature plug-in modules based on the ordering attribute information (col 1, ln 52-56).

19. As to claim 16, Lorenz teaches a call through an application program interface(col 7, ln 35-30).

20. As to claims 21-22, 24, they are apparatus claims of claims 5-6, 8; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 5-6, 8 above.

21. As to claim 29, it is an apparatus claim of claim 16; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 16 above.

22. Claims 10 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (5,829,053) in view of Lorenz et al (US. Patent 6,405,366 B1) and further in view of Hendrickson et al (US. Patent 5,933,646).

23. As to claim 10, Smith and Lorenz do not teach ordering the first plurality of feature plug-in modules based on the order selection information. However, Hendrickson teaches ordering the first plurality of feature plug-in modules based on the order selection information (col 5, ln 1-6).

Art Unit: 2194

24. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Smith, Lorenz and Hendrickson because Hendrickson's ordering the first plurality of feature plug-in modules based on the order selection information would enable a user to perform some end goal beyond basic computer operation.

25. As to claim 26, it is an apparatus claim of claims 10; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 10 above.

Allowable Subject Matter


19. Claims 7, 9, 23, 25 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).


MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100